1	LAW OFFICES OF NEIL JON BLOOMFIELD	
2	Neil Jon Bloomfield, Esq. (State Bar No. 52235) 901 E Street, Suite 100	
3	San Rafael, CA 94901 Telephone 415 454 2204	
4	Telephone: 415-454-2294 Facsimile: 415-457-5348	
5	njbloomfield@njblaw.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendant ULI ZANGPO	
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
1		
12	MARK MORRISON.	) No. CV 08 1945 EMC
	Plaintiff,	) ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST TO
13	vs.	STRIKE LATE-FILED SUR-REPLY
l4		WITHOUT LEAVE OF COURT
15	ULI ZANGPO,	)
	Defendant.	)
16		)
17		)
18		
19	Plaintiff Morrison's improperly filed "Second Declaration of Mark Morrison in Support of	
20	Opposition to Dismiss Due to Lack of Jurisdiction" (filed July 11, 2008 as Document #33) should be	
21	stricken from the record. The hearing on this Motion to Dismiss is scheduled for July 23 <sup>rd</sup> , 2008, and	
22	the parties completed briefing on July 9, 2008.	
)3		

The "Declaration" should not be considered by the Court for two reasons. First, it is not simply a supplemental declaration in support of Plaintiff's Opposition papers (the late filing of which would still be procedurally improper), but rather is a thinly-disguised reply brief.

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff's "Second Declaration in Support of Opposition" was clearly filed as a further reply to Defendant's reply pleadings. Such a document should not be considered by this Court.

The filing of the "Declaration" after the reply is in direct violation of Local Rules. Local Rule 7-3(d) provides that "once a reply is filed, no additional memoranda, papers or letters shall be filed without prior Court approval." Instead of properly seeking court approval for the filing of an additional "Declaration", Plaintiff simply filed its Declaration without permission.

However, Plaintiff's only mechanism for requesting court approval to file its additional paper was to move for administrative relief, as provided in Local Civil rule 7-11. Plaintiff failed to properly move the Court to consider its surreply, thinly disguised as a "Declaration in Opposition" to Defendant's Reply Brief. As such, the Declaration should be stricken.

If this request is not granted, Defendant will need further discovery on the issue of Plaintiff's domicile and further time to respond.

Dated: July 18, 2008 LAW OFFICES OF NEIL JON BLOOMFIELD

By: /s/.
Neil Jon Bloomfield
Attorney for Defendant Uli Zangpo